

The City further objects to this Interrogatory on the ground that it seeks the premature disclosure of the City's Exhibit Lists and Deposition Designations, before such disclosure is due in circumvention of Court Orders and the Parties' agreements and is also unduly burdensome and oppressive for that reason.

Subject to and without waiving its general and specific objections, the City responds as follows: the City refers Defendant to the Fourth Amended Complaint, which is incorporated by reference as if set forth in full here.

INTERROGATORY NO. 12

Do you contend that TOTAL has owned or operated an underground storage tank in the RGA? If your answer is anything other than an unqualified "no," please state the factual basis for your contention.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 12:

In addition to its General Objections and Limitations which are incorporated herein by reference, the City objects to this Interrogatory as unduly burdensome. Specifically, this Interrogatory was served by Defendant simultaneously with 12 other sets of Contention Interrogatories, Requests for Admission and Document Requests served by other defendants on November 18, 2008 and November 19, 2008. Collectively, this massive and unreasonable volume of the discovery contains over 240 separate interrogatories, requests for admission and document requests, some of which contain over 50 subparts each and which ask about facts contained in millions of pages of documents and the testimony of hundreds of witnesses, comprising tens of thousands of pages of deposition and other testimony. The City further objects that it requested a reasonable extension that was inappropriately and unreasonably refused by Defendant. The City further objects to the phrase "ever owned or operated" as vague, confusing and ambiguous.

The City also objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that it calls for premature disclosure of expert opinion, and seeks privileged attorney work product. The City further objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that topics related to this Interrogatory will be the subjects of expert testimony, which is governed by the rules concerning expert disclosures, relevant Court Orders and the Parties' agreements. The City further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks information that is equally available to Defendant, including, but not limited to, information from publicly available reports and databases, information contained in Defendant's own discovery responses and/or testimony given by Defendant's own witnesses in connection with this and/or similar litigation to which Defendant was and/or is a party.

The City further objects to this Interrogatory on the ground that a complete and accurate response might require analyses of additional spill reports and records, site remediation files, groundwater and plume modeling, and Defendant's expert analyses, which have not been fully produced by Defendant. The City also objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that a complete and accurate response might require analyses of Defendant's responses to the City's discovery requests, including without limitation responses related to product distribution,

commingled product liability, alternative liability and other proof standards set forth in the Court's Orders, including but not limited to the Court's May 13, 2008 Summary Judgment Opinion in *County of Suffolk, et al., v. Amerada Hess Corp. et al*, 04 Civ. 5424, which have not been fully produced by Defendant. The City also objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that a complete and accurate response might require analyses of Defendant's responses to Court-ordered disclosures regarding product distribution, successor liability and other matters, which have not been fully responded to by Defendant. The City reserves its right to request that the Court order Defendant to answer its own Interrogatory to the extent it seeks information from the City which Defendant itself has withheld. *See, e.g.*, Case Management Order # 31 in *County of Suffolk, et al., v. Amerada Hess Corp. et al*, 04 Civ. 5424 and the October 31, 2007 MDL Hearing Transcript at pp. 68-71. The City also objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that a complete and accurate response might require analyses of documents responsive to recently issued third-party subpoenas by certain defendants to pipeline companies and others, which have not yet been responded to by the relevant third-parties. The City reserves its right to amend this Response as it receives this information.

The City further objects to this Interrogatory on the ground that it seeks the premature disclosure of the City's Exhibit Lists and Deposition Designations, before such disclosure is due in circumvention of Court Orders and the Parties' agreements and is also unduly burdensome and oppressive for that reason.

Subject to and without waiving its general and specific objections, the City responds as follows: the City refers Defendant to the Fourth Amended Complaint, which is incorporated by reference as if set forth in full here.

INTERROGATORY NO. 13

Do you contend that TOTAL ever owned or operated a terminal or other gasoline storage/distribution facility in the RGA? If your answer is anything other than an unqualified "no," please state the factual basis for your contention.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 13:

In addition to its General Objections and Limitations which are incorporated herein by reference, the City objects to this Interrogatory as unduly burdensome. Specifically, this Interrogatory was served by Defendant simultaneously with 12 other sets of Contention Interrogatories, Requests for Admission and Document Requests served by other defendants on November 18, 2008 and November 19, 2008. Collectively, this massive and unreasonable volume of the discovery contains over 240 separate interrogatories, requests for admission and document requests, some of which contain over 50 subparts each and which ask about facts contained in millions of pages of documents and the testimony of hundreds of witnesses, comprising tens of thousands of pages of deposition and other testimony. The City further objects that it requested a reasonable extension that was inappropriately and unreasonably refused by Defendant. The City further objects to the phrase "ever owned or operated" as vague, confusing and ambiguous.

The City also objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that it calls for premature disclosure of expert opinion, and seeks privileged attorney work product. The City further objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that topics related to this Interrogatory will be the subjects of expert testimony, which is governed by the rules concerning expert disclosures, relevant Court Orders and the Parties' agreements. The City further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks information that is equally available to Defendant, including, but not limited to, information from publicly available reports and databases, information contained in Defendant's own discovery responses and/or testimony given by Defendant's own witnesses in connection with this and/or similar litigation to which Defendant was and/or is a party.

The City further objects to this Interrogatory on the ground that a complete and accurate response might require analyses of additional spill reports and records, site remediation files, groundwater and plume modeling, and Defendant's expert analyses, which have not been fully produced by Defendant. The City also objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that a complete and accurate response might require analyses of Defendant's responses to the City's discovery requests, including without limitation responses related to product distribution, commingled product liability, alternative liability and other proof standards set forth in the Court's Orders, including but not limited to the Court's May 13, 2008 Summary Judgment Opinion in *County of Suffolk, et al., v. Amerada Hess Corp.* et al, 04 Civ. 5424, which have not been fully produced by Defendant. The City also objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that a complete and accurate response might require analyses of Defendant's responses to Court-ordered disclosures regarding product distribution, successor liability and other matters, which have not been fully responded to by Defendant. The City reserves its right to request that the Court order Defendant to answer its own Interrogatory to the extent it seeks information from the City which Defendant itself has withheld. *See, e.g.,* Case Management Order # 31 in *County of Suffolk, et al., v. Amerada Hess Corp.* et al, 04 Civ. 5424 and the October 31, 2007 MDL Hearing Transcript at pp. 68-71. The City also objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that a complete and accurate response might require analyses of documents responsive to recently issued third-party subpoenas by certain defendants to pipeline companies and others, which have not yet been responded to by the relevant third-parties. The City reserves its right to amend this Response as it receives this information.

The City further objects to this Interrogatory on the ground that it seeks the premature disclosure of the City's Exhibit Lists and Deposition Designations, before such disclosure is due in circumvention of Court Orders and the Parties' agreements and is also unduly burdensome and oppressive for that reason.

Subject to and without waiving its general and specific objections, the City responds as follows: the City refers Defendant to the Fourth Amended Complaint, which is incorporated by reference as if set forth in full here.

INTERROGATORY NO. 14

Do you contend that TOTAL ever distributed or sold gasoline containing MTBE within the RGA? If your answer is anything other than an unqualified "no," please state the factual basis for your contention.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 14:

In addition to its General Objections and Limitations which are incorporated herein by reference, the City objects to this Interrogatory as unduly burdensome. Specifically, this Interrogatory was served by Defendant simultaneously with 12 other sets of Contention Interrogatories, Requests for Admission and Document Requests served by other defendants on November 18, 2008 and November 19, 2008. Collectively, this massive and unreasonable volume of the discovery contains over 240 separate interrogatories, requests for admission and document requests, some of which contain over 50 subparts each and which ask about facts contained in millions of pages of documents and the testimony of hundreds of witnesses, comprising tens of thousands of pages of deposition and other testimony. The City further objects that it requested a reasonable extension that was inappropriately and unreasonably refused by Defendant.

The City also objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that it calls for premature disclosure of expert opinion, and seeks privileged attorney work product. The City further objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that topics related to this Interrogatory will be the subjects of expert testimony, which is governed by the rules concerning expert disclosures, relevant Court Orders and the Parties' agreements. The City further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks information that is equally available to Defendant, including, but not limited to, information from publicly available reports and databases, information contained in Defendant's own discovery responses and/or testimony given by Defendant's own witnesses in connection with this and/or similar litigation to which Defendant was and/or is a party.

The City further objects to this Interrogatory on the ground that a complete and accurate response might require analyses of additional spill reports and records, site remediation files, groundwater and plume modeling, and Defendant's expert analyses, which have not been fully produced by Defendant. The City also objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that a complete and accurate response might require analyses of Defendant's responses to the City's discovery requests, including without limitation responses related to product distribution, commingled product liability, alternative liability and other proof standards set forth in the Court's Orders, including but not limited to the Court's May 13, 2008 Summary Judgment Opinion in *County of Suffolk, et al., v. Amerada Hess Corp. et al*, 04 Civ. 5424, which have not been fully produced by Defendant. The City also objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that a complete and accurate response might require analyses of Defendant's responses to Court-ordered disclosures regarding product distribution, successor liability and other matters, which have not been fully responded to by Defendant. The City reserves its right to request that the Court order Defendant to answer its own Interrogatory to the extent it seeks information from the City which Defendant itself has withheld. *See, e.g.*, Case Management Order # 31 in *County of Suffolk, et al., v. Amerada Hess Corp. et al*, 04 Civ. 5424 and the October 31, 2007 MDL Hearing Transcript at pp. 68-71. The City also objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that a complete and accurate response might require analyses of documents responsive to recently issued third-party subpoenas by certain defendants to pipeline companies and others, which have not yet been responded to by the relevant third-parties. The City reserves its right to amend this Response as it receives this information.

The City further objects to this Interrogatory on the ground that it seeks the premature disclosure of the City's Exhibit Lists and Deposition Designations, before such disclosure is due in circumvention of Court Orders and the Parties' agreements and is also unduly burdensome and oppressive for that reason.

Subject to and without waiving its general and specific objections, the City responds as follows: the City refers Defendant to the Fourth Amended Complaint, which is incorporated by reference as if set forth in full here.

INTERROGATORY NO. 15.

Do you contend that TOTAL ever held title to any gasoline containing MTBE while it was physically present in the RGA? If your answer is anything other than an unqualified "no," please state the factual basis for your contention.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 15:

In addition to its General Objections and Limitations which are incorporated herein by reference, the City objects to this Interrogatory as unduly burdensome. Specifically, this Interrogatory was served by Defendant simultaneously with 12 other sets of Contention Interrogatories, Requests for Admission and Document Requests served by other defendants on November 18, 2008 and November 19, 2008. Collectively, this massive and unreasonable volume of the discovery contains over 240 separate interrogatories, requests for admission and document requests, some of which contain over 50 subparts each and which ask about facts contained in millions of pages of documents and the testimony of hundreds of witnesses, comprising tens of thousands of pages of deposition and other testimony. The City further objects that it requested a reasonable extension that was inappropriately and unreasonably refused by Defendant.

The City also objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that it calls for premature disclosure of expert opinion, and seeks privileged attorney work product. The City further objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that topics related to this Interrogatory will be the subjects of expert testimony, which is governed by the rules concerning expert disclosures, relevant Court Orders and the Parties' agreements. The City further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks information that is equally available to Defendant, including, but not limited to, information from publicly available reports and databases, information contained in Defendant's own discovery responses and/or testimony given by Defendant's own witnesses in connection with this and/or similar litigation to which Defendant was and/or is a party.

The City further objects to this Interrogatory on the ground that a complete and accurate response might require analyses of additional spill reports and records, site remediation files, groundwater and plume modeling, and Defendant's expert analyses, which have not been fully produced by Defendant. The City also objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that a complete and accurate response might require analyses of Defendant's responses to the City's discovery requests, including without limitation responses related to product distribution, commingled product liability, alternative liability and other proof standards set forth in the Court's Orders, including but not limited to the Court's May 13, 2008 Summary Judgment

Opinion in *County of Suffolk, et al., v. Amerada Hess Corp. et al*, 04 Civ. 5424, which have not been fully produced by Defendant. The City also objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that a complete and accurate response might require analyses of Defendant's responses to Court-ordered disclosures regarding product distribution, successor liability and other matters, which have not been fully responded to by Defendant. The City reserves its right to request that the Court order Defendant to answer its own Interrogatory to the extent it seeks information from the City which Defendant itself has withheld. *See, e.g.*, Case Management Order # 31 in *County of Suffolk, et al., v. Amerada Hess Corp. et al*, 04 Civ. 5424 and the October 31, 2007 MDL Hearing Transcript at pp. 68-71. The City also objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that a complete and accurate response might require analyses of documents responsive to recently issued third-party subpoenas by certain defendants to pipeline companies and others, which have not yet been responded to by the relevant third-parties. The City reserves its right to amend this Response as it receives this information.

The City further objects to this Interrogatory on the ground that it seeks the premature disclosure of the City's Exhibit Lists and Deposition Designations, before such disclosure is due in circumvention of Court Orders and the Parties' agreements and is also unduly burdensome and oppressive for that reason.

Subject to and without waiving its general and specific objections, the City responds as follows: the City refers Defendant to the Fourth Amended Complaint, which is incorporated by reference as if set forth in full here.

INTERROGATORY NO. 16

Do you contend that TOTAL ever caused a release of gasoline containing MTBE that either could have or actually did contribute to any of the alleged actual or threatened contamination at issue in this case? If your answer is anything other than an unqualified "no," please state the factual basis for your contention.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 16:

In addition to its General Objections and Limitations which are incorporated herein by reference, the City objects to this Interrogatory as unduly burdensome. Specifically, this Interrogatory was served by Defendant simultaneously with 12 other sets of Contention Interrogatories, Requests for Admission and Document Requests served by other defendants on November 18, 2008 and November 19, 2008. Collectively, this massive and unreasonable volume of the discovery contains over 240 separate interrogatories, requests for admission and document requests, some of which contain over 50 subparts each and which ask about facts contained in millions of pages of documents and the testimony of hundreds of witnesses, comprising tens of thousands of pages of deposition and other testimony. The City further objects that it requested a reasonable extension that was inappropriately and unreasonably refused by Defendant. The City also objects that this Interrogatory is unreasonably duplicative of similar interrogatories served on November 19, 2008 on behalf of Defendant titled *Defendants' Contention Interrogatories and Document Requests on Causation, Theories of Liability and Apportionment of Damages*.

The City also objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that it calls for premature disclosure of expert opinion, and seeks privileged attorney work product. The City further objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that topics related to this Interrogatory will be the subjects of expert testimony, which is governed by the rules concerning expert disclosures, relevant Court Orders and the Parties' agreements. The City further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks information that is equally available to Defendant, including, but not limited to, information from publicly available reports and databases, information contained in Defendant's own discovery responses and/or testimony given by Defendant's own witnesses in connection with this and/or similar litigation to which Defendant was and/or is a party.

The City further objects to this Interrogatory on the ground that a complete and accurate response might require analyses of additional spill reports and records, site remediation files, groundwater and plume modeling, and Defendant's expert analyses, which have not been fully produced by Defendant. The City also objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that a complete and accurate response might require analyses of Defendant's responses to the City's discovery requests, including without limitation responses related to product distribution, commingled product liability, alternative liability and other proof standards set forth in the Court's Orders, including but not limited to the Court's May 13, 2008 Summary Judgment Opinion in *County of Suffolk, et al., v. Amerada Hess Corp. et al*, 04 Civ. 5424, which have not been fully produced by Defendant. The City also objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that a complete and accurate response might require analyses of Defendant's responses to Court-ordered disclosures regarding product distribution, successor liability and other matters, which have not been fully responded to by Defendant. The City reserves its right to request that the Court order Defendant to answer its own Interrogatory to the extent it seeks information from the City which Defendant itself has withheld. *See, e.g.*, Case Management Order # 31 in *County of Suffolk, et al., v. Amerada Hess Corp. et al*, 04 Civ. 5424 and the October 31, 2007 MDL Hearing Transcript at pp. 68-71. The City also objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that a complete and accurate response might require analyses of documents responsive to recently issued third-party subpoenas by certain defendants to pipeline companies and others, which have not yet been responded to by the relevant third-parties. The City reserves its right to amend this Response as it receives this information.

Subject to and without waiving its general and specific objections, the City responds as follows: the City refers Defendant to the Fourth Amended Complaint, which is incorporated by reference as if set forth in full here.

INTERROGATORY NO. 17

If your answer to Interrogatory No. 16 is anything other than an unqualified "no," for each of the following wells in the Jamaica Water System geographic area, please state whether you contend TOTAL caused a release of gasoline containing MTBE that either could have contributed or actually did contribute to any of the alleged actual or threatened contamination present at each such well, and state the factual basis for your contention.

- | | | | | | |
|----|-------------|----|-------------|----|-------------|
| a. | Well No. 5 | c. | Well No. 6 | e. | Well No. 6B |
| b. | Well No. 5A | d. | Well No. 6A | f. | Well No. 6D |

g.	Well No. 7	w.	Well No. 31	mm.	Well No. 48A.
h.	Well No. 7B	x.	Well No. 32	nn.	Well No. 49
i.	Well No. 10	y.	Well No. 33	oo.	Well No. 49A
j.	Well No. 10A	z.	Well No. 36	pp.	Well No. 50
k.	Well No. 13	aa.	Well No. 37	qq.	Well No. 50A
l.	Well No. 13A	bb.	Well No. 39	rr.	Well No. 51
m.	Well No. 18	cc.	Well No. 39A	ss.	Well No. 52
n.	Well No. 21	dd.	Well No. 41	tt.	Well No. 53
o.	Well No. 21A	ee.	Well No. 42	uu.	Well No. 53A
p.	Well No. 22	ff.	Well No. 42A	vv.	Well No. 54
q.	Well No. 23	gg.	Well No. 43	ww.	Well No. 54A
r.	Well No. 26	hh.	Well No. 43A	xx.	Well No. 55
s.	Well No. 26A	ii.	Well No. 45	yy.	Well No. 56
t.	Well No. 27	jj.	Well No. 47	zz.	Well No. 58
u.	Well No. 29	kk.	Well No. 47A	aaa.	Well No. 59
v.	Well No. 29A	ll.	Well No. 48		

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 17:

In addition to its General Objections and Limitations which are incorporated herein by reference, the City objects to this Interrogatory as unduly burdensome. Specifically, this Interrogatory was served by Defendant simultaneously with 12 other sets of Contention Interrogatories, Requests for Admission and Document Requests served by other defendants on November 18, 2008 and November 19, 2008. Collectively, this massive and unreasonable volume of the discovery contains over 240 separate interrogatories, requests for admission and document requests, some of which contain over 50 subparts each and which ask about facts contained in millions of pages of documents and the testimony of hundreds of witnesses, comprising tens of thousands of pages of deposition and other testimony. The City further objects that it requested a reasonable extension that was inappropriately and unreasonably refused by Defendant. The City also objects that this Interrogatory is unreasonably duplicative of Interrogatory No. 16. The City further objects that this Interrogatory is unreasonably duplicative of similar interrogatories served on November 19, 2008 on behalf of Defendant titled *Defendants' Contention Interrogatories and Document Requests on Causation, Theories of Liability and Apportionment of Damages*.

The City also objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that it calls for premature disclosure of expert opinion, and seeks privileged attorney work product. The City further objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that topics related to this Interrogatory will be the subjects of expert testimony, which is governed by the rules concerning expert disclosures, relevant Court Orders and the Parties' agreements. The City further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks information that is equally available to Defendant, including, but not limited to, information from publicly available reports and databases, information contained in Defendant's own discovery responses and/or testimony given by Defendant's own witnesses in connection with this and/or similar litigation to which Defendant was and/or is a party.

The City further objects to this Interrogatory on the ground that a complete and accurate response might require analyses of additional spill reports and records, site remediation files, groundwater and plume modeling, and Defendant's expert analyses, which have not been fully produced by Defendant. The City also objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that a complete and accurate response might require analyses of Defendant's responses to the City's discovery requests, including without limitation responses related to product distribution, commingled product liability, alternative liability and other proof standards set forth in the Court's Orders, including but not limited to the Court's May 13, 2008 Summary Judgment Opinion in *County of Suffolk, et al., v. Amerada Hess Corp. et al*, 04 Civ. 5424, which have not been fully produced by Defendant. The City also objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that a complete and accurate response might require analyses of Defendant's responses to Court-ordered disclosures regarding product distribution, successor liability and other matters, which have not been fully responded to by Defendant. The City reserves its right to request that the Court order Defendant to answer its own Interrogatory to the extent it seeks information from the City which Defendant itself has withheld. See, e.g., Case Management Order # 31 in *County of Suffolk, et al., v. Amerada Hess Corp. et al*, 04 Civ. 5424 and the October 31, 2007 MDL Hearing Transcript at pp. 68-71. The City also objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that a complete and accurate response might require analyses of documents responsive to recently issued third-party subpoenas by certain defendants to pipeline companies and others, which have not yet been responded to by the relevant third-parties. The City reserves its right to amend this Response as it receives this information.

The City further objects to this Interrogatory on the ground that it seeks the premature disclosure of the City's Exhibit Lists and Deposition Designations, before such disclosure is due in circumvention of Court Orders and the Parties' agreements and is also unduly burdensome and oppressive for that reason.

Subject to and without waiving its general and specific objections, the City responds as follows: the City refers Defendant to the Fourth Amended Complaint, which is incorporated by reference as if set forth in full here.

INTERROGATORY NO. 18

Do you contend that gasoline containing MTBE manufactured by TOTAL at its Port Arthur Refinery was actually delivered to any retail service stations within the RGA? If your answer is anything other than an unqualified "no," please state the factual basis for your contention. Please include in your answer all modes or routes of transportation you contend were used to deliver any such gasoline to the RGA. Also, please identify each retail service station you contend actually received a shipment of gasoline containing MTBE that was manufactured by TOTAL at its Port Arthur Refinery.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 18:

In addition to its General Objections and Limitations which are incorporated herein by reference, the City objects to this Interrogatory as unduly burdensome. Specifically, this Interrogatory was served by Defendant simultaneously with 12 other sets of Contention Interrogatories, Requests

for Admission and Document Requests served by other defendants on November 18, 2008 and November 19, 2008. Collectively, this massive and unreasonable volume of the discovery contains over 240 separate interrogatories, requests for admission and document requests, some of which contain over 50 subparts each and which ask about facts contained in millions of pages of documents and the testimony of hundreds of witnesses, comprising tens of thousands of pages of deposition and other testimony. The City further objects that it requested a reasonable extension that was inappropriately and unreasonably refused by Defendant.

The City also objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that it calls for premature disclosure of expert opinion, and seeks privileged attorney work product. The City further objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that topics related to this Interrogatory will be the subjects of expert testimony, which is governed by the rules concerning expert disclosures, relevant Court Orders and the Parties' agreements. The City further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks information that is equally available to Defendant, including, but not limited to, information from publicly available reports and databases, information contained in Defendant's own discovery responses and/or testimony given by Defendant's own witnesses in connection with this and/or similar litigation to which Defendant was and/or is a party.

The City further objects to this Interrogatory on the ground that a complete and accurate response might require analyses of additional spill reports and records, site remediation files, groundwater and plume modeling, and Defendant's expert analyses, which have not been fully produced by Defendant. The City also objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that a complete and accurate response might require analyses of Defendant's responses to the City's discovery requests, including without limitation responses related to product distribution, commingled product liability, alternative liability and other proof standards set forth in the Court's Orders, including but not limited to the Court's May 13, 2008 Summary Judgment Opinion in *County of Suffolk, et al., v. Amerada Hess Corp. et al*, 04 Civ. 5424, which have not been fully produced by Defendant. The City also objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that a complete and accurate response might require analyses of Defendant's responses to Court-ordered disclosures regarding product distribution, successor liability and other matters, which have not been fully responded to by Defendant. The City reserves its right to request that the Court order Defendant to answer its own Interrogatory to the extent it seeks information from the City which Defendant itself has withheld. *See, e.g.*, Case Management Order # 31 in *County of Suffolk, et al., v. Amerada Hess Corp. et al*, 04 Civ. 5424 and the October 31, 2007 MDL Hearing Transcript at pp. 68-71. The City also objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that a complete and accurate response might require analyses of documents responsive to recently issued third-party subpoenas by certain defendants to pipeline companies and others, which have not yet been responded to by the relevant third-parties. The City reserves its right to amend this Response as it receives this information.

The City further objects to this Interrogatory on the ground that it seeks the premature disclosure of the City's Exhibit Lists and Deposition Designations, before such disclosure is due in circumvention of Court Orders and the Parties' agreements and is also unduly burdensome and oppressive for that reason.

Subject to and without waiving its general and specific objections, the City responds as follows: the City refers Defendant to the Fourth Amended Complaint, which is incorporated by reference as if set forth in full here.

INTERROGATORY NO. 19

Do you contend that gasoline containing MTBE manufactured by TOTAL at its Big Spring Refinery was actually delivered to any retail service stations within the RGA? If your answer is anything other than an unqualified "no," please state the factual basis for your contention. Please include in your answer all modes or routes of transportation you contend were used to deliver any such gasoline to the RGA. Also, please identify each retail service station you contend actually received a shipment of gasoline containing MTBE that was manufactured by TOTAL at its Big Spring Refinery.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 19:

In addition to its General Objections and Limitations which are incorporated herein by reference, the City objects to this Interrogatory as unduly burdensome. Specifically, this Interrogatory was served by Defendant simultaneously with 12 other sets of Contention Interrogatories, Requests for Admission and Document Requests served by other defendants on November 18, 2008 and November 19, 2008. Collectively, this massive and unreasonable volume of the discovery contains over 240 separate interrogatories, requests for admission and document requests, some of which contain over 50 subparts each and which ask about facts contained in millions of pages of documents and the testimony of hundreds of witnesses, comprising tens of thousands of pages of deposition and other testimony. The City further objects that it requested a reasonable extension that was inappropriately and unreasonably refused by Defendant.

The City also objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that it calls for premature disclosure of expert opinion, and seeks privileged attorney work product. The City further objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that topics related to this Interrogatory will be the subjects of expert testimony, which is governed by the rules concerning expert disclosures, relevant Court Orders and the Parties' agreements. The City further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks information that is equally available to Defendant, including, but not limited to, information from publicly available reports and databases, information contained in Defendant's own discovery responses and/or testimony given by Defendant's own witnesses in connection with this and/or similar litigation to which Defendant was and/or is a party.

The City further objects to this Interrogatory on the ground that a complete and accurate response might require analyses of additional spill reports and records, site remediation files, groundwater and plume modeling, and Defendant's expert analyses, which have not been fully produced by Defendant. The City also objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that a complete and accurate response might require analyses of Defendant's responses to the City's discovery requests, including without limitation responses related to product distribution, commingled product liability, alternative liability and other proof standards set forth in the Court's Orders, including but not limited to the Court's May 13, 2008 Summary Judgment Opinion in *County of Suffolk, et al., v. Amerada Hess Corp. et al*, 04 Civ. 5424, which have not

been fully produced by Defendant. The City also objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that a complete and accurate response might require analyses of Defendant's responses to Court-ordered disclosures regarding product distribution, successor liability and other matters, which have not been fully responded to by Defendant. The City reserves its right to request that the Court order Defendant to answer its own Interrogatory to the extent it seeks information from the City which Defendant itself has withheld. *See, e.g.,* Case Management Order # 31 in *County of Suffolk, et al., v. Amerada Hess Corp. et al*, 04 Civ. 5424 and the October 31, 2007 MDL Hearing Transcript at pp. 68-71. The City also objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that a complete and accurate response might require analyses of documents responsive to recently issued third-party subpoenas by certain defendants to pipeline companies and others, which have not yet been responded to by the relevant third-parties. The City reserves its right to amend this Response as it receives this information.

The City further objects to this Interrogatory on the ground that it seeks the premature disclosure of the City's Exhibit Lists and Deposition Designations, before such disclosure is due in circumvention of Court Orders and the Parties' agreements and is also unduly burdensome and oppressive for that reason.

Subject to and without waiving its general and specific objections, the City responds as follows: the City refers Defendant to the Fourth Amended Complaint, which is incorporated by reference as if set forth in full here.

INTERROGATORY NO. 20

Do you contend that gasoline containing MTBE either blended or imported by TOTAL at its New Jersey Operations was actually delivered to any retail service stations within the RGA? If your answer is anything other than an unqualified "no," please state the factual basis for your contention. Please include in your answer all modes or routes of transportation you contend were used to deliver any such gasoline to the RGA. Also, please identify each retail service station you contend actually received a shipment of gasoline containing MTBE that was manufactured by TOTAL at its Big Spring Refinery.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 20:

In addition to its General Objections and Limitations which are incorporated herein by reference, the City objects to this Interrogatory as unduly burdensome. Specifically, this Interrogatory was served by Defendant simultaneously with 12 other sets of Contention Interrogatories, Requests for Admission and Document Requests served by other defendants on November 18, 2008 and November 19, 2008. Collectively, this massive and unreasonable volume of the discovery contains over 240 separate interrogatories, requests for admission and document requests, some of which contain over 50 subparts each and which ask about facts contained in millions of pages of documents and the testimony of hundreds of witnesses, comprising tens of thousands of pages of deposition and other testimony. The City further objects that it requested a reasonable extension that was inappropriately and unreasonably refused by Defendant. The City also objects that this Interrogatory is unreasonably duplicative of Interrogatory No. 19, in particular, it contains an identical request to Interrogatory 19, "Also,

please identify each retail service station you contend actually received a shipment of gasoline containing MTBE that was manufactured by TOTAL at its Big Spring Refinery.” The City further objects that this Interrogatory is unreasonably duplicative of similar interrogatories served on November 19, 2008 on behalf of Defendant titled *Defendants’ Contentions Interrogatories and Document Requests on Causation, Theories of Liability and Apportionment of Damages*.

The City also objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that it calls for premature disclosure of expert opinion, and seeks privileged attorney work product. The City further objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that topics related to this Interrogatory will be the subjects of expert testimony, which is governed by the rules concerning expert disclosures, relevant Court Orders and the Parties’ agreements. The City further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks information that is equally available to Defendant, including, but not limited to, information from publicly available reports and databases, information contained in Defendant’s own discovery responses and/or testimony given by Defendant’s own witnesses in connection with this and/or similar litigation to which Defendant was and/or is a party.

The City further objects to this Interrogatory on the ground that a complete and accurate response might require analyses of additional spill reports and records, site remediation files, groundwater and plume modeling, and Defendant’s expert analyses, which have not been fully produced by Defendant. The City also objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that a complete and accurate response might require analyses of Defendant’s responses to the City’s discovery requests, including without limitation responses related to product distribution, commingled product liability, alternative liability and other proof standards set forth in the Court’s Orders, including but not limited to the Court’s May 13, 2008 Summary Judgment Opinion in *County of Suffolk, et al., v. Amerada Hess Corp.* et al, 04 Civ. 5424, which have not been fully produced by Defendant. The City also objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that a complete and accurate response might require analyses of Defendant’s responses to Court-ordered disclosures regarding product distribution, successor liability and other matters, which have not been fully responded to by Defendant. The City reserves its right to request that the Court order Defendant to answer its own Interrogatory to the extent it seeks information from the City which Defendant itself has withheld. *See, e.g.,* Case Management Order # 31 in *County of Suffolk, et al., v. Amerada Hess Corp.* et al, 04 Civ. 5424 and the October 31, 2007 MDL Hearing Transcript at pp. 68-71. The City also objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that a complete and accurate response might require analyses of documents responsive to recently issued third-party subpoenas by certain defendants to pipeline companies and others, which have not yet been responded to by the relevant third-parties. The City reserves its right to amend this Response as it receives this information.

The City further objects to this Interrogatory on the ground that it seeks the premature disclosure of the City’s Exhibit Lists and Deposition Designations, before such disclosure is due in circumvention of Court Orders and the Parties’ agreements and is also unduly burdensome and oppressive for that reason.

Subject to and without waiving its general and specific objections, the City responds as follows: the City refers Defendant to the Fourth Amended Complaint, which is incorporated by reference as if set forth in full here.

INTERROGATORY NO. 21

Do you contend that TOTAL ever sold, distributed, or otherwise held title to any gasoline containing MTBE that was actually delivered to any retail stations within the RGA? If your answer is anything other than an unqualified "no," please state the factual basis for your contention. Please include in your answer all modes or routes of transportation you contend were used by TOTAL to sell or distribute gasoline containing MTBE either directly to retail stations within the RGA or to distributors who ultimately delivered such gasoline to retail stations within the RGA. Also, please identify each delivery point or retail service station you contend actually received a shipment of gasoline containing MTBE that was sold or distributed by TOTAL, or to which TOTAL otherwise ever held title.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 21:

In addition to its General Objections and Limitations which are incorporated herein by reference, the City objects to this Interrogatory as unduly burdensome. Specifically, this Interrogatory was served by Defendant simultaneously with 12 other sets of Contention Interrogatories, Requests for Admission and Document Requests served by other defendants on November 18, 2008 and November 19, 2008. Collectively, this massive and unreasonable volume of the discovery contains over 240 separate interrogatories, requests for admission and document requests, some of which contain over 50 subparts each and which ask about facts contained in millions of pages of documents and the testimony of hundreds of witnesses, comprising tens of thousands of pages of deposition and other testimony. The City further objects that it requested a reasonable extension that was inappropriately and unreasonably refused by Defendant.

The City also objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that it calls for premature disclosure of expert opinion, and seeks privileged attorney work product. The City further objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that topics related to this Interrogatory will be the subjects of expert testimony, which is governed by the rules concerning expert disclosures, relevant Court Orders and the Parties' agreements. The City further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks information that is equally available to Defendant, including, but not limited to, information from publicly available reports and databases, information contained in Defendant's own discovery responses and/or testimony given by Defendant's own witnesses in connection with this and/or similar litigation to which Defendant was and/or is a party.

The City further objects to this Interrogatory on the ground that a complete and accurate response might require analyses of additional spill reports and records, site remediation files, groundwater and plume modeling, and Defendant's expert analyses, which have not been fully produced by Defendant. The City also objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that a complete and accurate response might require analyses of Defendant's responses to the City's discovery requests, including without limitation responses related to product distribution, commingled product liability, alternative liability and other proof standards set forth in the

Court's Orders, including but not limited to the Court's May 13, 2008 Summary Judgment Opinion in *County of Suffolk, et al., v. Amerada Hess Corp. et al*, 04 Civ. 5424, which have not been fully produced by Defendant. The City also objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that a complete and accurate response might require analyses of Defendant's responses to Court-ordered disclosures regarding product distribution, successor liability and other matters, which have not been fully responded to by Defendant. The City reserves its right to request that the Court order Defendant to answer its own Interrogatory to the extent it seeks information from the City which Defendant itself has withheld. *See, e.g.*, Case Management Order # 31 in *County of Suffolk, et al., v. Amerada Hess Corp. et al*, 04 Civ. 5424 and the October 31, 2007 MDL Hearing Transcript at pp. 68-71. The City also objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that a complete and accurate response might require analyses of documents responsive to recently issued third-party subpoenas by certain defendants to pipeline companies and others, which have not yet been responded to by the relevant third-parties. The City reserves its right to amend this Response as it receives this information.

The City further objects to this Interrogatory on the ground that it seeks the premature disclosure of the City's Exhibit Lists and Deposition Designations, before such disclosure is due in circumvention of Court Orders and the Parties' agreements and is also unduly burdensome and oppressive for that reason.

Subject to and without waiving its general and specific objections, the City responds as follows: the City refers Defendant to the Fourth Amended Complaint, which is incorporated by reference as if set forth in full here.

INTERROGATORY NO. 22

Do you contend that TOTAL had either an express agreement or tacit understanding with any Defendant or third party to manufacture or distribute gasoline containing MTBE for an unlawful purpose? If your answer is anything other than an unqualified "no," please provide the factual basis for your contention that TOTAL had either an express agreement or tacit understanding with any Defendant or third party to accomplish an unlawful purpose by manufacturing or distributing gasoline containing MTBE. Please identify in your answer:

- A. every piece of evidence you believe substantiates your contention that TOTAL had either an express agreement or tacit understanding with any Defendant or third party
- B. each Defendant or third party with whom you contend TOTAL had such an express agreement or tacit understanding
- C. each unlawful purpose you contend TOTAL sought to achieve by means of such agreement or understanding
- D. each intentional act you contend was performed by TOTAL furtherance of such agreement or understanding all damages you contend you suffered as a result of such agreement or understanding.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 22:

In addition to its General Objections and Limitations which are incorporated herein by reference, the City objects to this Interrogatory as unduly burdensome. Specifically, this Interrogatory was served by Defendant simultaneously with 12 other sets of Contention Interrogatories, Requests for Admission and Document Requests served by other defendants on November 18, 2008 and November 19, 2008. Collectively, this massive and unreasonable volume of the discovery contains over 240 separate interrogatories, requests for admission and document requests, some of which contain over 50 subparts each and which ask about facts contained in millions of pages of documents and the testimony of hundreds of witnesses, comprising tens of thousands of pages of deposition and other testimony. The City further objects that it requested a reasonable extension that was inappropriately and unreasonably refused by Defendant.

The City also objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that it calls for premature disclosure of expert opinion, and seeks privileged attorney work product. The City further objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that topics related to this Interrogatory will be the subjects of expert testimony, which is governed by the rules concerning expert disclosures, relevant Court Orders and the Parties' agreements. The City further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks information that is equally available to Defendant, including, but not limited to, information from publicly available reports and databases, information contained in Defendant's own discovery responses and/or testimony given by Defendant's own witnesses in connection with this and/or similar litigation to which Defendant was and/or is a party.

The City further objects to this Interrogatory on the ground that it seeks the premature disclosure of the City's Exhibit Lists and Deposition Designations, before such disclosure is due in circumvention of Court Orders and the Parties' agreements and is also unduly burdensome and oppressive for that reason. The City also objects to this Interrogatory on the basis that it seeks "every piece of evidence" as being unduly burdensome, over broad, oppressive and not generally within the practical capabilities of a party to respond.

Subject to and without waiving its general and specific objections, the City responds as follows: the City refers Defendant to the Fourth Amended Complaint, which is incorporated by reference as if set forth in full here.

INTERROGATORY NO. 23

Do you contend that TOTAL misrepresented any facts concerning MTBE and/or TBA? If your answer anything other than an unqualified "no," please state the factual basis for your contention. In your answer please identify each such alleged misrepresentation made by TOTAL, including the individual(s) making the statement, the individual(s) to whom the statement was made, the date of the statement, and the Bates number or deposition transcript citation of any evidence supporting your contention.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 23:

In addition to its General Objections and Limitations which are incorporated herein by reference, the City objects to this Interrogatory as unduly burdensome. Specifically, this Interrogatory was served by Defendant simultaneously with 12 other sets of Contention Interrogatories, Requests

for Admission and Document Requests served by other defendants on November 18, 2008 and November 19, 2008. Collectively, this massive and unreasonable volume of the discovery contains over 240 separate interrogatories, requests for admission and document requests, some of which contain over 50 subparts each and which ask about facts contained in millions of pages of documents and the testimony of hundreds of witnesses, comprising tens of thousands of pages of deposition and other testimony. The City further objects that it requested a reasonable extension that was inappropriately and unreasonably refused by Defendant.

The City also objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that it calls for premature disclosure of expert opinion, and seeks privileged attorney work product. The City further objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that topics related to this Interrogatory will be the subjects of expert testimony, which is governed by the rules concerning expert disclosures, relevant Court Orders and the Parties' agreements. The City further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks information that is equally available to Defendant, including, but not limited to, information from publicly available reports and databases, information contained in Defendant's own discovery responses and/or testimony given by Defendant's own witnesses in connection with this and/or similar litigation to which Defendant was and/or is a party.

The City further objects to this Interrogatory on the ground that it seeks the premature disclosure of the City's Exhibit Lists and Deposition Designations, before such disclosure is due in circumvention of Court Orders and the Parties' agreements and is also unduly burdensome and oppressive for that reason.

Subject to and without waiving its general and specific objections, the City responds as follows: the City refers Defendant to the Fourth Amended Complaint, which is incorporated by reference as if set forth in full here.

INTERROGATORY NO. 24

Do you contend that TOTAL improperly withheld any information concerning MTBE and/or TBA from any federal, state, or local government entity or agency? If your answer is anything other than an unqualified "no," please state the factual basis for your contention. In your answer please identify the information that was improperly withheld, the employees or agents of TOTAL with knowledge of such information, the date(s) on which such knowledge was acquired, the government entities or agencies to whom you contend such information should have been disclosed, and the date on which such disclosure should have taken place.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 24:

In addition to its General Objections and Limitations which are incorporated herein by reference, the City objects to this Interrogatory as unduly burdensome. Specifically, this Interrogatory was served by Defendant simultaneously with 12 other sets of Contention Interrogatories, Requests for Admission and Document Requests served by other defendants on November 18, 2008 and November 19, 2008. Collectively, this massive and unreasonable volume of the discovery contains over 240 separate interrogatories, requests for admission and document requests, some of which contain over 50 subparts each and which ask about facts contained in millions of pages

of documents and the testimony of hundreds of witnesses, comprising tens of thousands of pages of deposition and other testimony. The City further objects that it requested a reasonable extension that was inappropriately and unreasonably refused by Defendant.

The City also objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that it calls for premature disclosure of expert opinion, and seeks privileged attorney work product. The City further objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that topics related to this Interrogatory will be the subjects of expert testimony, which is governed by the rules concerning expert disclosures, relevant Court Orders and the Parties' agreements. The City further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks information that is equally available to Defendant, including, but not limited to, information from publicly available reports and databases, information contained in Defendant's own discovery responses and/or testimony given by Defendant's own witnesses in connection with this and/or similar litigation to which Defendant was and/or is a party.

The City further objects to this Interrogatory on the ground that it seeks the premature disclosure of the City's Exhibit Lists and Deposition Designations, before such disclosure is due in circumvention of Court Orders and the Parties' agreements and is also unduly burdensome and oppressive for that reason.

Subject to and without waiving its general and specific objections, the City responds as follows: the City refers Defendant to the Fourth Amended Complaint, which is incorporated by reference as if set forth in full here.

INTERROGATORY NO. 25

Please identify each fact you contend "Defendants secretly shared with [TOTAL regarding] the dangers and risks posed by manufacturing, marketing, distributing, designing, supplying, and selling [MTBE and gasoline containing MTBE]."

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 25:

In addition to its General Objections and Limitations which are incorporated herein by reference, the City objects to this Interrogatory as unduly burdensome. Specifically, this Interrogatory was served by Defendant simultaneously with 12 other sets of Contention Interrogatories, Requests for Admission and Document Requests served by other defendants on November 18, 2008 and November 19, 2008. Collectively, this massive and unreasonable volume of the discovery contains over 240 separate interrogatories, requests for admission and document requests, some of which contain over 50 subparts each and which ask about facts contained in millions of pages of documents and the testimony of hundreds of witnesses, comprising tens of thousands of pages of deposition and other testimony. The City further objects that it requested a reasonable extension that was inappropriately and unreasonably refused by Defendant.

The City also objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that it calls for premature disclosure of expert opinion, and seeks privileged attorney work product. The City further objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that topics related to this Interrogatory will be the subjects of expert testimony, which is governed by the rules concerning expert disclosures, relevant Court Orders

and the Parties' agreements. The City further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks information that is equally available to Defendant, including, but not limited to, information from publicly available reports and databases, information contained in Defendant's own discovery responses and/or testimony given by Defendant's own witnesses in connection with this and/or similar litigation to which Defendant was and/or is a party.

The City further objects to this Interrogatory on the ground that it seeks the premature disclosure of the City's Exhibit Lists and Deposition Designations, before such disclosure is due in circumvention of Court Orders and the Parties' agreements and is also unduly burdensome and oppressive for that reason.

Subject to and without waiving its general and specific objections, the City responds as follows: the City refers Defendant to the Fourth Amended Complaint, which is incorporated by reference as if set forth in full here.

INTERROGATORY NO. 26

Please identify each fact you contend Defendants secretly shared with TOTAL regarding Defendants' "knowledge of leaking underground storage tanks."

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 26:

In addition to its General Objections and Limitations which are incorporated herein by reference, the City objects to this Interrogatory as unduly burdensome. Specifically, this Interrogatory was served by Defendant simultaneously with 12 other sets of Contention Interrogatories, Requests for Admission and Document Requests served by other defendants on November 18, 2008 and November 19, 2008. Collectively, this massive and unreasonable volume of the discovery contains over 240 separate interrogatories, requests for admission and document requests, some of which contain over 50 subparts each and which ask about facts contained in millions of pages of documents and the testimony of hundreds of witnesses, comprising tens of thousands of pages of deposition and other testimony. The City further objects that it requested a reasonable extension that was inappropriately and unreasonably refused by Defendant.

The City also objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that it calls for premature disclosure of expert opinion, and seeks privileged attorney work product. The City further objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that topics related to this Interrogatory will be the subjects of expert testimony, which is governed by the rules concerning expert disclosures, relevant Court Orders and the Parties' agreements. The City further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks information that is equally available to Defendant, including, but not limited to, information from publicly available reports and databases, information contained in Defendant's own discovery responses and/or testimony given by Defendant's own witnesses in connection with this and/or similar litigation to which Defendant was and/or is a party.

The City further objects to this Interrogatory on the ground that it seeks the premature disclosure of the City's Exhibit Lists and Deposition Designations, before such disclosure is due in

circumvention of Court Orders and the Parties' agreements and is also unduly burdensome and oppressive for that reason.

Subject to and without waiving its general and specific objections, the City responds as follows: the City refers Defendant to the Fourth Amended Complaint, which is incorporated by reference as if set forth in full here.

INTERROGATORY NO. 27

Please identify each statement you contend was made either by TOTAL or on TOTAL's behalf which denied information contained in the "1986 public report issued by the Maine Department of Environmental Protection."

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 27:

In addition to its General Objections and Limitations which are incorporated herein by reference, the City objects to this Interrogatory as unduly burdensome. Specifically, this Interrogatory was served by Defendant simultaneously with 12 other sets of Contention Interrogatories, Requests for Admission and Document Requests served by other defendants on November 18, 2008 and November 19, 2008. Collectively, this massive and unreasonable volume of the discovery contains over 240 separate interrogatories, requests for admission and document requests, some of which contain over 50 subparts each and which ask about facts contained in millions of pages of documents and the testimony of hundreds of witnesses, comprising tens of thousands of pages of deposition and other testimony. The City further objects that it requested a reasonable extension that was inappropriately and unreasonably refused by Defendant.

The City also objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that it calls for premature disclosure of expert opinion, and seeks privileged attorney work product. The City further objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that topics related to this Interrogatory will be the subjects of expert testimony, which is governed by the rules concerning expert disclosures, relevant Court Orders and the Parties' agreements. The City further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks information that is equally available to Defendant, including, but not limited to, information from publicly available reports and databases, information contained in Defendant's own discovery responses and/or testimony given by Defendant's own witnesses in connection with this and/or similar litigation to which Defendant was and/or is a party.

The City further objects to this Interrogatory on the ground that it seeks the premature disclosure of the City's Exhibit Lists and Deposition Designations, before such disclosure is due in circumvention of Court Orders and the Parties' agreements and is also unduly burdensome and oppressive for that reason.

Subject to and without waiving its general and specific objections, the City responds as follows: the City refers Defendant to the Fourth Amended Complaint, which is incorporated by reference as if set forth in full here.

INTERROGATORY NO. 28

Please state the date on which you contend the United States Environmental Protection Agency received a copy of the “1986 public report issued by the Maine Department of Environmental Protection.”

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 28:

In addition to its General Objections and Limitations which are incorporated herein by reference, the City objects to this Interrogatory as unduly burdensome. Specifically, this Interrogatory was served by Defendant simultaneously with 12 other sets of Contention Interrogatories, Requests for Admission and Document Requests served by other defendants on November 18, 2008 and November 19, 2008. Collectively, this massive and unreasonable volume of the discovery contains over 240 separate interrogatories, requests for admission and document requests, some of which contain over 50 subparts each and which ask about facts contained in millions of pages of documents and the testimony of hundreds of witnesses, comprising tens of thousands of pages of deposition and other testimony. The City further objects that it requested a reasonable extension that was inappropriately and unreasonably refused by Defendant.

The City also objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that it calls for premature disclosure of expert opinion, and seeks privileged attorney work product. The City further objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that topics related to this Interrogatory will be the subjects of expert testimony, which is governed by the rules concerning expert disclosures, relevant Court Orders and the Parties’ agreements. The City further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks information that is equally available to Defendant, including, but not limited to, information from publicly available reports and databases, information contained in Defendant’s own discovery responses and/or testimony given by Defendant’s own witnesses in connection with this and/or similar litigation to which Defendant was and/or is a party.

The City further objects to this Interrogatory on the ground that it seeks the premature disclosure of the City’s Exhibit Lists and Deposition Designations, before such disclosure is due in circumvention of Court Orders and the Parties’ agreements and is also unduly burdensome and oppressive for that reason.

Subject to and without waiving its general and specific objections, the City responds as follows: the City refers Defendant to the Fourth Amended Complaint, which is incorporated by reference as if set forth in full here.

INTERROGATORY NO. 29

Please state each fact upon which you base your contention that TOTAL “privately possessed knowledge that validated the Maine Report’s findings.”

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 29:

In addition to its General Objections and Limitations which are incorporated herein by reference, the City objects to this Interrogatory as unduly burdensome. Specifically, this Interrogatory was served by Defendant simultaneously with 12 other sets of Contention Interrogatories, Requests for Admission and Document Requests served by other defendants on November 18, 2008 and November 19, 2008. Collectively, this massive and unreasonable volume of the discovery contains over 240 separate interrogatories, requests for admission and document requests, some of which contain over 50 subparts each and which ask about facts contained in millions of pages of documents and the testimony of hundreds of witnesses, comprising tens of thousands of pages of deposition and other testimony. The City further objects that it requested a reasonable extension that was inappropriately and unreasonably refused by Defendant.

The City also objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that it calls for premature disclosure of expert opinion, and seeks privileged attorney work product. The City further objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that topics related to this Interrogatory will be the subjects of expert testimony, which is governed by the rules concerning expert disclosures, relevant Court Orders and the Parties' agreements. The City further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks information that is equally available to Defendant, including, but not limited to, information from publicly available reports and databases, information contained in Defendant's own discovery responses and/or testimony given by Defendant's own witnesses in connection with this and/or similar litigation to which Defendant was and/or is a party.

The City further objects to this Interrogatory on the ground that it seeks the premature disclosure of the City's Exhibit Lists and Deposition Designations, before such disclosure is due in circumvention of Court Orders and the Parties' agreements and is also unduly burdensome and oppressive for that reason.

Subject to and without waiving its general and specific objections, the City responds as follows: the City refers Defendant to the Fourth Amended Complaint, which is incorporated by reference as if set forth in full here.

INTERROGATORY NO. 30

Please state each fact upon which you base your contention that TOTAL "intentionally withheld information, suppressed industry research, and/or intentionally made misrepresentations about MTBE's safety."

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 30:

In addition to its General Objections and Limitations which are incorporated herein by reference, the City objects to this Interrogatory as unduly burdensome. Specifically, this Interrogatory was served by Defendant simultaneously with 12 other sets of Contention Interrogatories, Requests for Admission and Document Requests served by other defendants on November 18, 2008 and November 19, 2008. Collectively, this massive and unreasonable volume of the discovery contains over 240 separate interrogatories, requests for admission and document requests, some

of which contain over 50 subparts each and which ask about facts contained in millions of pages of documents and the testimony of hundreds of witnesses, comprising tens of thousands of pages of deposition and other testimony. The City further objects that it requested a reasonable extension that was inappropriately and unreasonably refused by Defendant.

The City also objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that it calls for premature disclosure of expert opinion, and seeks privileged attorney work product. The City further objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that topics related to this Interrogatory will be the subjects of expert testimony, which is governed by the rules concerning expert disclosures, relevant Court Orders and the Parties' agreements. The City further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks information that is equally available to Defendant, including, but not limited to, information from publicly available reports and databases, information contained in Defendant's own discovery responses and/or testimony given by Defendant's own witnesses in connection with this and/or similar litigation to which Defendant was and/or is a party.

The City further objects to this Interrogatory on the ground that it seeks the premature disclosure of the City's Exhibit Lists and Deposition Designations, before such disclosure is due in circumvention of Court Orders and the Parties' agreements and is also unduly burdensome and oppressive for that reason.

Subject to and without waiving its general and specific objections, the City responds as follows: the City refers Defendant to the Fourth Amended Complaint, which is incorporated by reference as if set forth in full here.

INTERROGATORY NO. 31

Do you contend that TOTAL failed to issue adequate warnings to their customers or downstream handlers regarding the characteristics of MTBE? If your answer is anything other than an unqualified "no," please state the factual basis for your contention that warnings issued by TOTAL were inadequate. Please include in your answer each warning that you contend TOTAL should have provided, the persons or entities to which you contend the warning should have been provided, and the date on which such warning should have been provided.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 31:

In addition to its General Objections and Limitations which are incorporated herein by reference, the City objects to this Interrogatory as unduly burdensome. Specifically, this Interrogatory was served by Defendant simultaneously with 12 other sets of Contention Interrogatories, Requests for Admission and Document Requests served by other defendants on November 18, 2008 and November 19, 2008. Collectively, this massive and unreasonable volume of the discovery contains over 240 separate interrogatories, requests for admission and document requests, some of which contain over 50 subparts each and which ask about facts contained in millions of pages of documents and the testimony of hundreds of witnesses, comprising tens of thousands of pages of deposition and other testimony. The City further objects that it requested a reasonable extension that was inappropriately and unreasonably refused by Defendant.

The City also objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that it calls for premature disclosure of expert opinion, and seeks privileged attorney work product. The City further objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that topics related to this Interrogatory will be the subjects of expert testimony, which is governed by the rules concerning expert disclosures, relevant Court Orders and the Parties' agreements. The City further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks information that is equally available to Defendant, including, but not limited to, information from publicly available reports and databases, information contained in Defendant's own discovery responses and/or testimony given by Defendant's own witnesses in connection with this and/or similar litigation to which Defendant was and/or is a party.

The City further objects to this Interrogatory on the ground that it seeks the premature disclosure of the City's Exhibit Lists and Deposition Designations, before such disclosure is due in circumvention of Court Orders and the Parties' agreements and is also unduly burdensome and oppressive for that reason.

Subject to and without waiving its general and specific objections, the City responds as follows: the City refers Defendant to the Fourth Amended Complaint, which is incorporated by reference as if set forth in full here.

INTERROGATORY NO. 32

For each warning identified in response to Interrogatory No. 31, do you contend that each such warning would have altered the behavior of the recipient? If your answer is anything other than an unqualified "no," please state the factual basis for your contention. Include in your answer the precise means by which you contend the recipient of the warning would have altered their behavior.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 32:

In addition to its General Objections and Limitations which are incorporated herein by reference, the City objects to this Interrogatory as unduly burdensome. Specifically, this Interrogatory was served by Defendant simultaneously with 12 other sets of Contention Interrogatories, Requests for Admission and Document Requests served by other defendants on November 18, 2008 and November 19, 2008. Collectively, this massive and unreasonable volume of the discovery contains over 240 separate interrogatories, requests for admission and document requests, some of which contain over 50 subparts each and which ask about facts contained in millions of pages of documents and the testimony of hundreds of witnesses, comprising tens of thousands of pages of deposition and other testimony. The City further objects that it requested a reasonable extension that was inappropriately and unreasonably refused by Defendant. The City further objects that the term "recipient" is vague, ambiguous, and undefined. The City further objects that the Interrogatory calls for speculation regarding the conduct of third parties.

The City also objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that it calls for premature disclosure of expert opinion, and seeks privileged attorney work product. The City further objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that topics related to this Interrogatory will be the subjects of expert testimony, which is governed by the rules concerning expert disclosures, relevant Court Orders

and the Parties' agreements. The City further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks information that is equally available to Defendant, including, but not limited to, information from publicly available reports and databases, information contained in Defendant's own discovery responses and/or testimony given by Defendant's own witnesses in connection with this and/or similar litigation to which Defendant was and/or is a party.

Subject to and without waiving its general and specific objections, the City responds as follows: the City refers Defendant to the Fourth Amended Complaint, which is incorporated by reference as if set forth in full here.

INTERROGATORY NO. 33

Identify all persons with knowledge of any factual information included in your responses to TOTAL's First Set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents to Plaintiff City of New York.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 33:

In addition to its General Objections and Limitations which are incorporated herein by reference, the City objects to this Interrogatory as unduly burdensome. Specifically, this Interrogatory was served by Defendant simultaneously with 12 other sets of Contention Interrogatories, Requests for Admission and Document Requests served by other defendants on November 18, 2008 and November 19, 2008. Collectively, this massive and unreasonable volume of the discovery contains over 240 separate interrogatories, requests for admission and document requests, some of which contain over 50 subparts each and which ask about facts contained in millions of pages of documents and the testimony of hundreds of witnesses, comprising tens of thousands of pages of deposition and other testimony. The City further objects that it requested a reasonable extension that was inappropriately and unreasonably refused by Defendant.

The City also objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that it calls for premature disclosure of expert opinion, and seeks privileged attorney work product. The City further objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that topics related to this Interrogatory will be the subjects of expert testimony, which is governed by the rules concerning expert disclosures, relevant Court Orders and the Parties' agreements. The City further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks information that is equally available to Defendant, including, but not limited to, information from publicly available reports and databases, information contained in Defendant's own discovery responses and/or testimony given by Defendant's own witnesses in connection with this and/or similar litigation to which Defendant was and/or is a party.

The City further objects to this Interrogatory on the ground that it seeks the premature disclosure of the City's Exhibit Lists and Deposition Designations, before such disclosure is due in circumvention of Court Orders and the Parties' agreements and is also unduly burdensome and oppressive for that reason. The City also objects to this Interrogatory on the basis that it seeks "persons with knowledge of any factual information included in your responses" as being unduly burdensome, over broad, oppressive and not generally within the practical capabilities of a party to respond.

RESPONSES TO REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 1

Produce all documents supporting your assertion, if any, that gasoline containing MTBE that was manufactured, blended, distributed, or sold by TOTAL could have reached, or did in fact reach, the RGA.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 1:

In addition to its General Objections and Limitations which are incorporated herein by reference, the City objects to this Request for Production as unduly burdensome. Specifically, this Request for Production was served by Defendant simultaneously with 12 other sets of Contention Interrogatories, Requests for Admission and Document Requests served by other defendants on November 18, 2008 and November 19, 2008. Collectively, this massive and unreasonable volume of the discovery contains over 240 separate interrogatories, requests for admission and document requests, some of which contain over 50 subparts each and which ask about facts contained in millions of pages of documents and the testimony of hundreds of witnesses, comprising tens of thousands of pages of deposition and other testimony. The City further objects that it requested a reasonable extension that was inappropriately and unreasonably refused by Defendant.

The City further objects to this Request for Production on the ground that it seeks the premature disclosure of the City's Exhibit Lists and Deposition Designations before such disclosure is due in circumvention of Court Orders and is also unduly burdensome for that reason. Furthermore, City objects to this Request for Production on the ground that it seeks the premature disclosure of expert-related documents, in violation of relevant Court Orders and the Parties' agreements. The City will not produce documents in response to this Request, but will instead disclose its Exhibit Lists, Deposition Designations and expert-related documents to Defendant at the appropriate times as set forth in the relevant Court Orders and in accordance with the Parties' agreements.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 2

Produce all documents supporting your assertion, if any, that gasoline containing MTBE that was manufactured, blended, distributed, or sold by TOTAL could have reached, or did in fact reach, any service station in the RGA.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 2:

In addition to its General Objections and Limitations which are incorporated herein by reference, the City objects to this Request for Production as unduly burdensome. Specifically, this Request for Production was served by Defendant simultaneously with 12 other sets of Contention Interrogatories, Requests for Admission and Document Requests served by other defendants on November 18, 2008 and November 19, 2008. Collectively, this massive and unreasonable volume of the discovery contains over 240 separate interrogatories, requests for admission and document requests, some of which contain over 50 subparts each and which ask about facts

contained in millions of pages of documents and the testimony of hundreds of witnesses, comprising tens of thousands of pages of deposition and other testimony. The City further objects that it requested a reasonable extension that was inappropriately and unreasonably refused by Defendant.

The City further objects to this Request for Production on the ground that it seeks the premature disclosure of the City's Exhibit Lists and Deposition Designations before such disclosure is due in circumvention of Court Orders and is also unduly burdensome for that reason. Furthermore, City objects to this Request for Production on the ground that it seeks the premature disclosure of expert-related documents, in violation of relevant Court Orders and the Parties' agreements. The City will not produce documents in response to this Request, but will instead disclose its Exhibit Lists, Deposition Designations and expert-related documents to Defendant at the appropriate times as set forth in the relevant Court Orders and in accordance with the Parties' agreements.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 3

Produce all documents supporting your assertion, if any, that gasoline containing MTBE that was manufactured, blended, distributed, or sold by TOTAL could have caused or contributed to, or did in fact cause or contribute to, any of the alleged contamination present at any of the City's wells listed in Interrogatory No. 2.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 3:

In addition to its General Objections and Limitations which are incorporated herein by reference, the City objects to this Request for Production as unduly burdensome. Specifically, this Request for Production was served by Defendant simultaneously with 12 other sets of Contention Interrogatories, Requests for Admission and Document Requests served by other defendants on November 18, 2008 and November 19, 2008. Collectively, this massive and unreasonable volume of the discovery contains over 240 separate interrogatories, requests for admission and document requests, some of which contain over 50 subparts each and which ask about facts contained in millions of pages of documents and the testimony of hundreds of witnesses, comprising tens of thousands of pages of deposition and other testimony. The City further objects that it requested a reasonable extension that was inappropriately and unreasonably refused by Defendant.

The City further objects to this Request for Production on the ground that it seeks the premature disclosure of the City's Exhibit Lists and Deposition Designations before such disclosure is due in circumvention of Court Orders and is also unduly burdensome for that reason. Furthermore, City objects to this Request for Production on the ground that it seeks the premature disclosure of expert-related documents, in violation of relevant Court Orders and the Parties' agreements. The City will not produce documents in response to this Request, but will instead disclose its Exhibit Lists, Deposition Designations and expert-related documents to Defendant at the appropriate times as set forth in the relevant Court Orders and in accordance with the Parties' agreements.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 4

Produce all documents you obtained from sources other than TOTAL from which you intend to calculate TOTAL's regional or national share of the market for crude refining capacity, gasoline production generally, production of gasoline containing MTBE, or retail sales of gasoline products.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 4:

In addition to its General Objections and Limitations which are incorporated herein by reference, the City objects to this Request for Production as unduly burdensome. Specifically, this Request for Production was served by Defendant simultaneously with 12 other sets of Contention Interrogatories, Requests for Admission and Document Requests served by other defendants on November 18, 2008 and November 19, 2008. Collectively, this massive and unreasonable volume of the discovery contains over 240 separate interrogatories, requests for admission and document requests, some of which contain over 50 subparts each and which ask about facts contained in millions of pages of documents and the testimony of hundreds of witnesses, comprising tens of thousands of pages of deposition and other testimony. The City further objects that it requested a reasonable extension that was inappropriately and unreasonably refused by Defendant.

The City further objects to this Request for Production on the ground that it seeks the premature disclosure of the City's Exhibit Lists and Deposition Designations before such disclosure is due in circumvention of Court Orders and is also unduly burdensome for that reason. Furthermore, City objects to this Request for Production on the ground that it seeks the premature disclosure of expert-related documents, in violation of relevant Court Orders and the Parties' agreements. The City will not produce documents in response to this Request, but will instead disclose its Exhibit Lists, Deposition Designations and expert-related documents to Defendant at the appropriate times as set forth in the relevant Court Orders and in accordance with the Parties' agreements.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 5

Produce all documents you relied upon in answering the Interrogatories set forth above.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 5:

In addition to its General Objections and Limitations which are incorporated herein by reference, the City objects to this Request for Production as unduly burdensome. Specifically, this Request for Production was served by Defendant simultaneously with 12 other sets of Contention Interrogatories, Requests for Admission and Document Requests served by other defendants on November 18, 2008 and November 19, 2008. Collectively, this massive and unreasonable volume of the discovery contains over 240 separate interrogatories, requests for admission and document requests, some of which contain over 50 subparts each and which ask about facts contained in millions of pages of documents and the testimony of hundreds of witnesses, comprising tens of thousands of pages of deposition and other testimony. The City further

objects that it requested a reasonable extension that was inappropriately and unreasonably refused by Defendant.

The City further objects to this Request for Production on the ground that it seeks the premature disclosure of the City's Exhibit Lists and Deposition Designations before such disclosure is due in circumvention of Court Orders and is also unduly burdensome for that reason. Furthermore, City objects to this Request for Production on the ground that it seeks the premature disclosure of expert-related documents, in violation of relevant Court Orders and the Parties' agreements. The City will not produce documents in response to this Request, but will instead disclose its Exhibit Lists, Deposition Designations and expert-related documents to Defendant at the appropriate times as set forth in the relevant Court Orders and in accordance with the Parties' agreements.

Dated: San Francisco, California
December 19, 2008

MICHAEL A. CARDOZO
Corporation Counsel of the City of New York
Attorney for Plaintiff City of New York
100 Church Street
New York, New York 10007
(212) 788-1568

SHER LEFF LLP
450 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94105
(415) 348-8300

By:




VICTOR M. SHER (*pro hac vice*)
TODD E. ROBINS (*pro hac vice*)
NICHOLAS G. CAMPINS (*pro hac vice*)

Attorneys for Plaintiff City of New York

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Kristin Meyers, hereby certify that on December 19, 2008, a true and correct copy of the foregoing Plaintiff City of New York's Responses and Objections to Total Petrochemicals USA, Inc.'s First Set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents was served via Lexis Nexis File & Serve on all counsel of record in this action.



Kristin Meyers